



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/649,215	08/28/2000	Allan Lamkin	68570	7416

22242 7590 05/25/2004

FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY
120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER

VU, TUAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 05/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/649,215

Applicant(s)

LAMKIN ET AL.

Examiner

Tuan A Vu

Art Unit

2124

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuan A Vu, John Chavis.

(3) Tom Lebens.

(2) Lamkin, Allan.

(4) Martin Bader.

Date of Interview: 05/20/2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tahara, Brodersen.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant refer to 3 steps of claim 1; and asked for clarification of how the cited portions of Brodersen read on those step limitations. Examiner has pointed that the missing part for which Brodersen is used as to remedying the Tahara's reference lies in the replacing of variables found when viewing authoring files, and the looking into files has been suggested in Tahara already. Applicant disagreed on Brodersen's disclosing of those 3 steps but Examiner noted that the rejection is based on obviousness and thus individual references would not cover 100% of the limitations. Applicant pointed out that Tahara does not teach a authoring tool but Examiner rebutted that the claim is broad enough that Tahara's teaching still applies. Examiner has pointed out that Brodersen also teaches selecting of files and processing to replace some variables in the process of authoring and layout audio/video data as required from the claimed steps (which Applicant qualifies as dynamic and inventive over the static/conventional method of Brodersen). Examiner also indicated the fact of replacing a tagged variables in a markup document in view of the teachings by Tahara or well-known concepts available at the time of the invention would be a feature Applicant should consider should any amendment be effected to overcome rejection by obviousness .